

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 20 are amended. Independent claims 1, 9, and 13 are amended to more precisely recite the features of the invention. Support for the amendment can be found at least in Figure 2 and at page 8, lines 21-25, page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 3, and page 10, line 2 of the specification. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,485,370 to Moss et al. (hereafter Moss). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Moss is directed to system and a method that provide communication between a user-friendly terminal and a number of service provider computers such as financial institutions. However, Moss does not disclose or suggest “obtaining a list of target nodes and a tool definition from a runnable tool, wherein the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model, and wherein the roles define which management functions a user can perform on target nodes associated with the SCM module; obtaining roles associated with a tool from the tool definition,” as recited in amended claim 1. Nowhere does Moss teach or suggest the feature of using roles to determine if a user is authorized to run a tool at a target node.

Furthermore, Moss does not disclose or suggest “checking if any of the roles associated with the tool are enabled ... checking if the user is authorized for at least one of the enabled roles on the target nodes,” as recited in amended claim 1. Moss does not teach or suggest the use of roles, let alone the features of checking if any of the roles are enabled and checking if the user is authorized for one of the enabled roles. Since Moss does not disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 9, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss does not disclose or suggest “the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model ... roles associated with a tool, the roles defining which management functions a user can perform on the target nodes associated with the SCM module; and a security manager that checks whether any of the roles associated with the tool is enabled, and whether the user is authorized for one of the enabled roles,” as recited in amended claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 10-12 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 13, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss does not disclose or suggest "obtaining a list of target nodes and tool definition from a runnable tool, wherein the tool definition specifies roles associated with a tool via an authorization model, and wherein the roles define which management functions a user can perform on target nodes associated with the SCM module; obtaining roles associated with the tool from the tool definition; checking if any of the roles associated with the tool are enabled; and checking if the user is authorized for one of the roles associated with the tool on all of the target nodes," as recited in amended claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is allowable.


Claims 14-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 13 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **December 1, 2004**



Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739